REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were pending as of the action mailed on February 7, 2007. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 13-14, 17-18 and 21-22 have been amended for clarity and definition, without changing their scope.

No new matter has been added.

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. To expedite prosecution, the applicant has amended claims 1 and 13 as suggested by the examiner.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 13-14, 17-18 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Wright (U.S. Patent No. 7,089,508 B1).

Claim 1. As amended, claim 1 recites "displaying, on a display device, a transaction screen containing data for a transaction" and "refreshing the transaction screen with updated (i.e., changed) data if user input is not received within a pre-determined period of time."

The examiner asserts that Wright discloses all features of claim 1, citing col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 40. The applicant disagrees. The portion of Wright cited by the examiner reads in pertinent part as follows:

> If the processor 209 determines input signals are not being received (indicating that the user is performing non-computer activity), the processor signals the input generator 207 to generate pseudo user inputs at step 325. The pseudo inputs from input generator 207 are interrupt signals corresponding to commands from a computer input device (such as a keyboard or mouse) to the central processing unit 102 of the computer. Thus, the generated pseudo inputs will prevent the screen saver from activating. . . . It is advantageous that the commands be non-disruptive to the computer user while preventing the screen saver from activating. For example, if the user is working on a document on the computer and then turns away to answer the telephone, a pseudo user input corresponding to a command to press the Scroll Lock key (a non-character-generating key)

> would not disrupt the user's document. [col. 4, line 64 – col. 5, line 19] (emphasis added)

Wright discloses a system for preventing the activation of a screen saver that would otherwise activate due to lack of user activity. In particular, Wright discloses technique for specifically preventing the change of what is displayed (e.g., by the screen saver) on a display device. In contrast, claim 1 recites just the opposite where what is displayed (e.g., the transaction screen) is refreshed with updated (i.e., changed) data.

In addition, none of portions of Wright relied upon by the examiner disclose or suggest a transaction screen containing data for a transaction, much less refreshing the transaction screen, as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Wright explicitly teaches away from updating data being displayed on a transaction screen (i.e., changing what is displayed) when disclosing that it is strictly advantageous not to affect what is being displayed on the screen.

The applicant respectfully submits that for the above reasons claim 1, and claims 2-4, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 2, as amended, recites "simulating user input requesting that the transaction screen be refreshed." The examiner contends that Wright discloses this feature of claim 2 stating, "simulating user input requesting that the screen be refreshed . . . refreshing the screen . . . (col. 5, lines 46-54; a pseudo user input would be generated which inherently keep the screen refreshed)". The applicant disagrees. The cited portion of Wright reads as follows:

> When the timer 210 expires at step 425, the processor 209 determines whether the motion sensor 205 has detected any non-computer activity has taken place during the period. If the processor 209 determines that non-computer activity has taken place during the period the timer 210 was running, the processor 209 signals the input generator 207 to generate a pseudo user input at step 430 to prevent the activation of the screen saver. The method 400 then returns to step 415 to restart the timer 210 to detect non-computer user activity. [col. 5, lines 46-54] (emphasis added)

Nowhere in the portion of Wright relied upon by the examiner does Wright disclose "keeping the screen refreshed." Instead, Wright discloses that activation of a screen saver is prevented, thus preserving whatever is being displayed on the screen. Preserving whatever is

being displayed is exactly the opposite of refreshing the transaction screen with updated data, as recited in claim 2.

Moreover, Wright discloses generating pseudo user input to prevent activation of the screen saver. Wright proposes generating pseudo input of mouse movement or non-character-generating keyboard input – or in general, input that is non-disruptive (*see* col. 5, lines 9-13). The portion of Wright relied upon by the examiner does not disclose or suggest simulating user input that requests that a transaction screen be refreshed, which causes the displayed data to change, as recited in claim 2.

The applicant respectfully submits that for the above reasons, and the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 9. Claims 5 and 9 are independent claims that correspond to claim 1 and stand rejected by the examiner for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, claims 5 and 9, as well as their respective dependent claims 6-8 and 10-12, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 13, 17 and 21. Claims 13, 17 and 21 include features similar to those of claim 1 and stand rejected by the examiner for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, claims 13, 17 and 21, as well as their respective dependent claims 14-16, 18-20 and 22-24, are in condition for allowance.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 15-16, 19-20, and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Wright.

Claim 3. Claim 3 recites "displaying a transaction screen is performed by [a] client" and "simulating user input is performed by [a] server."

In rejecting claim 3, the examiner asserts that "in a client/server environment, any combination of distributed operations could be delegated between the client and server depending on design and implementation choice." The applicant disagrees and notes that the claim does not disclose "any combination of distributed operations delegated between a client

and a server." The applicant respectfully submits that the examiner cannot simply reject the specific features of claim 3, namely "displaying a transaction screen is performed by the client" and "simulating input is performed by the server", without a specific teaching of these features. For the above reasons, and for the reasons set forth in reference to claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23. Claims 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23 include features corresponding to those of claim 3 and are allowable for the reasons the forth above with respect to claim 3.

Conclusion

Each of the pending claims has been addressed above, or depends from a claim addressed above.

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the action and allowance of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 07 May 07

/Hans R. Troesch/
Hans R. Troesch
Reg. No. 36,950

Customer No. 32864
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071